

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 and 35-62 are pending in the application. Claims 33 and 34 have been canceled. Claims 1-23, 25, 27, 30-31, 37-56 and 59 are withdrawn. Claims 24, 26, 28-29, 32, 35-36, 57, and 58 were finally rejected.

In response to the Final Office Action of July 12, 2006 and Advisory Action of December 12, 2006, Claims 234, 26, 28, 29, 35, 57, and 58 have been amended. Independent Claims 24, 26, and 57 have been amended to recite that the visible light sensitizer is an alpha-diketone. Claims 26 and 58 have also been amended to recite that the cationically polymerizable resin is selected from epoxides and oxetanes. Dependent Claims 28 and 29 have been amended to specify that the polymerizable resin is an oxetane and epoxy resin, respectively. Dependent Claim 35 has been amended to now depend upon independent Claim 26. In addition, new dependent Claims 60 and 61 (reciting a filler) have been added.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that "[t]he showing of unexpected results is considered to overcome the rejection of claims as being obvious over the cited prior art wherein the visible light sensitizer is an alpha diketone, such as camphorquinone." Thus, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recited that the visible light sensitizer is selected from alpha-diketones. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are commensurate with the Oxman Declaration and are thus allowable over the prior art.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner also stated that "[w]hile oxetane compounds would be expected to polymerize in a similar fashion to epoxy compounds, it was not clear whether the same results would be clearly expected from vinyl ethers or spiro-orthocarbonates." Thus, Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the cationically polymerizable resin is selected

from epoxides and oxetanes. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are commensurate with the Oxman Declaration and are thus allowable over the prior art.

The Examiner also stated that the Oxman Declaration did not show that an improved depth of cure is obtained in compositions that are not highly filled. While Applicant agrees that all of the experiments in the Oxman Declaration involved filled compositions, it does not stand to reason that the results would not also be applicable to unfilled compositions. Paragraphs 0068 to 0075 describe the use of such fillers generally. Importantly, fillers are optional components of the photopolymerizable compositions, and polymerization of the cationically polymerizable resins is generally easier to perform in unfilled systems. Thus, the improved depth of cure results that occurred with a combination of an alpha-diketone visible light sensitizer in conjunction with the alkoxy substituted anthracene in the filled compositions of the Oxman Declaration would also be expected in an unfilled composition.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner discusses data on Tables 1B, 2, and 4 of the specification. Applicant, however, respectfully submits that such data is not relevant to the currently pending claims. The novelty of the currently pending claims (as demonstrated by the Oxman Declaration) resides in the combination of an alpha-diketone visible light sensitizer combined with an electron donor which is an alkoxy substituted anthracene. Improved depth of cure results were shown compared to systems using only an alpha-diketone alone or an alkoxy anthracene alone. In contrast, an alpha diketone (camphorquinone) was used in all of the experiments in the Tables cited by the Examiner. The data in the tables is provided to illustrate the improved results provided in unelected, withdrawn claims (e.g. claim 1) that cover a photoinitiator system comprising a first anthracene combined with a second substituted

anthracene (*e.g.* alkoxylated anthracene). Thus, it is unclear to Applicant as to why the Examiner believes the data to be relevant to the currently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and eventual issuance. Such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments which need be addressed in order to obtain allowance, please contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Acknowledgement of receipt is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Lana Knedlik, Reg. No. 42,748
STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP
1201 Walnut Ste 2900
Kansas City, MO 64106-2150
Telephone: (816) 842-8600
Facsimile: (816) 691-3495